

MEETING SUMMARY

CALIFORNIA WATER PLAN: UPDATE 2013

LAND USE CAUCUS MEETING JANUARY 26, 2012 9:00 A.M - 12:30 P.M.

CENTER FOR COLLABORATIVE POLICY 815 S STREET, SACRAMENTO, CA

Meeting Purpose:

The California Water Plan (CWP) Land Use Caucus is a statewide topic-based workgroup designed to support development of CWP Update 2013 through in-depth discussions and deliberations of Land Use topics and issues. The Land Use Caucus will identify and expand information associated with Land Use related to statewide and regional needs, opportunities and challenges. Meeting materials can be found online here:

http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/materials/index.cfm?subject=jan2612

Meeting Goals:

To discuss the role of the Caucus in Update of CWP Update 2013 Resource Management Strategy, Regional Reports, and Preparing of the Progress Report; and to provide a status of the Land Use Tool and Land Use Scenarios Linkages.

Attendance: (See Attached)

Action Items:

#	Item	Owner	Due Date
1.	Engage California Energy Commission and invite participation in	Lisa Beutler	Next
	future Land Use Caucus Meetings. Other state agencies may be invited		Meeting
	to participate as well.		
2.	Invite U.S. Forest Service representatives to February 2 Public AC meeting.	Lisa Beutler	Done
3.	Distribute Draft Meeting Notes to session attendees.	Joshua	2/10
		Biggs/Lisa	
		Beutler	
4.	Provide feedback on draft "Recommendations" section for Land use	Caucus	2/6
	Resource Management strategy, and suggested edits to RMS chapter for	members	
	the 2013 Update to Hoa Ly (<u>hly@water.ca.gov</u>)		
5.	(Optional) Provide feedback to OPR on Annual Planning Survey from	Caucus	4/1
	meeting attendees is welcome. Suggestions can be emailed to	members	
	Cuauhtemoc Gonzalez (<u>Cuauhtemoc.Gonzalez@opr.ca.gov</u>)		
6.	Report back to caucus on progress of Land Use tool Pilot Project.	Alex Hinds,	Next
		Elizabeth	Meeting
		Patterson	
7.	Add Regional Reports storyboard to the California Water Plan Update	Lew Moeller	2/15



	2013 Website.		
8.	Provide feedback on the Regional Reports to Hoa Ly (hly@water.ca.gov). Please provide feedback with the perspective of a land use caucus member. Please, look at the outlines and regional report. Also, think about your regional relationships.	Caucus Members	2/6
9.	Schedule follow-up conference call for caucus participants on Land Use caucus input for Water Plan Progress Reports.	Megan Fidell, Lisa Beutler	3/1
10.	Provide feedback on Water Plan Progress Report on recommendations for Land Use objectives. Please reference the "highlights" document from the Water Plan Update 2009. All feedback to be sent to Hoa Ly (hly@water.ca.gov)	Caucus members	2/15
11.	Provide any data sources relating to Land Use – Scenarios Linkages to Hoa Ly (hly@water.ca.gov).	Caucus members	2/15
12.	Send out homework assignment reminder.	Lisa Beutler ,Elizabeth Patterson	1/30, 2/5, 2/14

Announcements:

None

Welcome and Introductions:

Lisa Beutler (Executive Facilitator for the California Water Plan) and Elizabeth Patterson (DWR) began the meeting with opening remarks, an agenda review, and ground rules. Introductions were done for all meeting participants, including those attending through the webinar. The Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) was introduced as the lead agency on the Land Use update to the Water Plan, and was represented by Scott Morgan, Allison Joe, and Ben Rubin.

Review of Land Use Caucus Charter:

Elizabeth Patterson thanked all meeting participants for their time and willingness to attend, and noted that official membership of the Caucus will be established following this meeting. The group was provided hard copies of the charters as handouts, and was encouraged to review the Water Plan charter Standing Language, and the Land Use Caucus charter.

It was stated that the Land Use Resource Management Strategy (RMS) has always been a big part of the water plan, as had the Land Use caucus. Though land use is one of the more contentious issues in California water, the water plan has always found way to present it in a balanced manner. In 2009, the team chose to go ahead with some pilot projects, and the caucus will coordinate closely with them through this next update. The primary focus of the *California Water Plan Update 2013* Land Use caucus will be an update to the Land Use RMS that incorporates the pilot projects and existing land use initiatives, as well as available Federal, State, Tribal, regional and local public and private efforts and planning initiatives.



The meeting attendees were directed to the caucus schedule and deliverables on the second page of the Land Use charter, and a quick overview of the meeting agenda happened.

Land Use Resource Management Strategy:

• Water Plan Resource Management Strategies (RMS's): describe the range of choices for meeting resource management objectives. For each strategy, an estimate of benefits and magnitude of cost can inform the estimate of statewide Integrated Water Management (IWM) costs through 2050.

Allison Joe from OPR gave a PowerPoint presentation to the group:

- OPR and the Water Plan
 - o OPR serves the Governor and his Cabinet as staff for long-range planning and research, and constitutes the comprehensive state planning agency.
 - o OPR has traditionally helped update the Land Use RMS.
 - o OPR is involved in other Water Plan Update Committees and Caucuses.
- Summary of Key 2013 Updates to the Land Use RMS chapters
- New Legislation
 - o SB 226 (2011)
 - o SB 244 (2011)
 - o AB 900 (2011)
- Additional Edits to Consider in Future Iterations
 - o Content
 - o Overall Consistency & Reference Updates
- Recommendations
 - o We are particularly looking for feedback on this section.
 - o General Recommendation categories
- Timeline and Next Steps
 - o Caucus comments due February 6 (to Hoa Ly hly@water.ca.gov)
 - o Public draft in March will be released for a 30-day review period
- Resources
 - The RMS Draft can be viewed online at:
 http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/docs/meeting_materials/caucus/2012.01.26/Land-use-RMS_Chapter_OPRedits.pdf

Some group discussion followed the presentation. Cross – membership in other Water Plan caucuses was encouraged, especially the Flood Caucus. A handout was distributed with bullets summarizing the key messages from the RMS update.

Comments from the group on the Chapter 24 Land Use Planning and Management included:



Comment: "On page one, the sentence where you mention integrating local water management and land use plans – I don't think there is enough emphasis on Flood. I think you should beef up the text around flood management."

Comment: "There should be tailored language surrounding urban and rural flexibilities."

Comment: "The language in this section is too weak. These things are needed to do this. Replace the "coulds" with "shoulds" and take a tone that suggests a stronger call to action"

Comment: "The language here is encouraging for the locals. It is important that this is not a mandate from the State"

Comment: "I suggest that we use this section to further educate the water community on SB 375."

Ben Rubin (OPR) noted that any suggestions regarding diagrams or images to include are welcome. OPR is open to suggestions on graphic content from the Land Use caucus.

Comment: Instead of just calling development "urban" and "rural"; distinguish "suburban" development.

Comment: The "best practices" from bullet 18 should be shared with the Agricultural Stewardship group, and the Federal agency network for input.

Comment: The last sentence in bullet 20, on the "user friendly portal"; I was involved in a similar effort with the Energy commission, and we should take the opportunity to discuss this with them.

Other discussion focused on the role and definition of AB 857 (Statewide planning priorities), an OPR listsery, and additional information on including "Flood" in the RMS update. **Flagged discussions** included future talks on the role of the Delta Stewardship Council in regional land use planning (Section 3), and an ongoing policy discussion for input processes relating to local planning and land use regulation.

Lew Moller (DWR) informed the group know that the Water Plan does have a Water Technology Caucus, and that they are requesting technology recommendations.

Annual Planning Survey:

Scott Morgan (OPR) gave a presentation on the Annual Planning survey:

- 472 Jurisdictions responded to the survey, which is 87% of local governments in California.
- Some of the questions are "standing items", while others are recently developed.
- Some of the questions relate to Water issues in California, and tie into the work with the Water Plan.
- This year, OPR has shifted in format to the Survey Monkey because of superior data presentation.



Mr. Morgan also discussed the Book of Lists (BOL), a publication that contains the results from OPR's local government annual planning survey. The BOL summarizes the status of local general plans, directories of California's city and county planning agencies, Councils of Government, Local Agency Formation Commissions, Tribal Governments, state and federal agencies, CEQA Judges, and more. The BOL can be found on OPR's website at: http://opr.ca.gov/s publications.php#pubs-B

A short discussion among meeting participants resulted in the BOL being noted as a good source for the data methods in the RMS.

Land Use Tool:

Elizabeth Patterson (DWR) and Alex Hinds (Sonoma State) gave a presentation on an ongoing pilot project in Sonoma County.

The project is a partnership between DWR regional districts, the academic community, local agencies, and the Sonoma mountain Village – a "One planet community". The work they are doing will result in the development of a land use cost driven decision tree. The purpose of the land use decision tool is to show that low impact development is a cost effective approach. The scale of this tool can be site-specific, or it can be watershed scale. This is a large scale project, and one of six in the world. This will be an easy to digest, easy to assimilate format. Another related effort is looking at a county-wide approach for identifying future and in-the-pipeline efforts. These pilot studies are ongoing, and the Land Use Caucus will be updated as these projects change. The Water Plan Public Advisory Committee will also receive updates on the Pilot Projects.

Regional Reports:

 Regional Reports: describe the regional resource management objectives, as well as funding proposals and priorities

Lew Moller (DWR) gave a presentation on the Regional Reports, and how they will interface with the Land Use caucus. The regional reports team will be looking for input from the Land Use caucus on how land use decisions affect planning at the regional level. The Regional Reports for California Water Plan Update 2013 will be more focuses on the "sub-regional" level than in previous iterations. Key points to the Regional Reports are:

- Identifying Regional Goals to support (i.e. Groundwater management)
- The Land Use element of the Water Plan will be integral to the success of the Regional Reports.
- The Report will look to show policy impacts at the regional level
- This is a focus on the applications of RMS's within the Regions.
- The Regional reports allow us to show the implications of implementation, and the consequences of "no action"



Lew Moller asked the group for the Top 3 priority topics each individual would like to see addressed in the regional reports (i.e. Flood Management, Water Quality, IRWM). Also, if the group could provide potential sources of data, that would be helpful to the Regional Reports team. All Water Plan participants are invited to make suggestions on the outline/storyboard available on the website.

Group Discussion followed the presentation on Regional Reports. Summarized points were:

- Some members recommended brining up the issue of Federal involvement in regional design, and involvement with the Forest Service.
- Communities need to work with the Forest Service on water issues. There room to improve collaboration.

Progress Report:

• Progress Report: Is a standalone report issued off cycle from the Water Plan Update. The progress reports look to determine if Water Plan Update Recommendations from the previous iteration of the plan are being implemented.

Megan Fidell (DWR) presented to the caucus on the upcoming California Water Plan Progress Reports. Each caucus is being asked to fill out an evaluation form (one submitted per caucus) for the Progress Reports team. A draft of the evaluation form was handed out to the meeting participants, and a conference call will be scheduled in the future for caucus members to provide input.

Land Use – Scenarios Linkages:

• California Water Plan Update 2005 introduced a new analytical approach to evaluating future water management conditions: multiple future scenarios and alternative response packages. The scenarios are not meant to be forecasts of the future, but represent alternatively plausible conditions for the future. Response packages are comprised of different mixes of resource management strategies. Scenarios are shaped by factors considered to be beyond the control of water managers. Each scenario has alternative values for some factors such as population growth and land use. Water Plan scenarios are used to explore questions about the future; for example, what will the year 2050 be like if California's population continues to grow at the rate it has over the past several years, and what if the rate increases over the next 10, 20, or more years? How will shifting land use influence future water demands for agriculture or municipalities?

Rich Juricich (DWR) presented briefly on the linkages between the work of the Land Use Caucus, and the Water Plan Scenarios. Mr. Juricich gave an overview of example outputs, including *UPlan*. The *UPlan* model makes distinctions between population, growth, and land use. Data inputs for the model come from sources provided by Water Plan participants. On January 4, 2012, a focus group team meeting was held on updating the Land Use scenarios. The group will continue to meet



regularly to refine the tool, and this topic will go out before the State Agency Steering Committee (SASC)

• A survey will be going out to meeting participants asking for data sources.

Question: Does the scenarios modeling of agricultural land include dry-land farming or ranchland? Answer: *UPlan* can show that. Water uses here is primarily identical to irrigated agricultural land, and the tool also shows spatial patterns of growth.

As is the practice for Water Plan sessions, the meeting was **Adjourned** at the scheduled time.

Attendance:

Note: (W) = Attended via Web

Group Co-Leads

- 1. Allison Joe, OPR
- 2. Scott Morgan, OPR
- 3. Elizabeth Patterson, DWR
- 4. Ben Rubin, OPR

Participants

- 5. Marian Ashe (W), California EPA
- 6. Karen Buhr (W)
- 7. Merita Callaway (W)
- 8. Nick Cammarota (W)
- 9. Celeste Cantu (W), Santa Anna Water Plan
- 10. Evon Chambers, PCL
- 11. Walter Clevenger (W), Sierra Nevada Conservancy
- 12. Tammy Cronin, SGC
- 13. Kristin Donovan, SGC
- 14. Elizabeth Doughery (W)
- 15. Karen Dove, PCL
- 16. Amparo Flores (W)
- 17. Catherine Gill (W)
- 18. Bruce Gwynne, DOC
- 19. Al Herson, APA
- 20. Alex Hinds, CSU Sonoma
- 21. John Hopkins, IEH
- 22. Rich Juricich, DWR

Meeting Staff (MWH)

- 40. Lisa Beutler, Executive Facilitator
- 41. Joshua Biggs, Note Taker

- 23. Karen Keene
- 24. Nick Konovaloff, RCRC
- 25. Allison Lassiter, UC Berkeley
- 26. Hoa Ly, DWR
- 27. Paul McDougall, CA HCD
- 28. Danny Merkley, California Farm Bureau Federation
- 29. Lew Moeller, DWR
- 30. Cliff Moriyama (W)
- 31. James Nachbaur (W), LAO
- 32. Kyra Ross (W), League of California Cities
- 33. Al Schiff, CPUC
- 34. Nathaniel Roth (W), UC Davis
- 35. Michelle Selmon (W)
- 36. Chris Soulard (W), USGS
- 37. Alexandra Stehl (W)
- 38. Jennifer Svec (W)
- 39. Bob Wilkinson (W), UC Santa Barbara